

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22

BEFORE THE  
ILLINOIS COMMERCE COMMISSION

IN THE MATTER OF: )  
 )  
CITIZENS UTILITY BOARD AND THE )  
PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF )  
ILLINOIS ) No. 06-0379  
 )  
Petition to Initiate ) Emergency Status  
Rulemaking with Notice and )  
Comment for Approval of )  
Certain Amendments to Illinois )  
Administrative Code Part 280. )

Chicago, Illinois  
May 18, 2006

Met pursuant to notice at 11:00 a.m.

BEFORE:

MS. CLAUDIA SAINSOT, Administrative Law Judge

1        APPEARANCES:

2        MS. JANICE DALE,  
3        OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL  
4        100 West Randolph Street  
5        Suite 1100  
6        Chicago, Illinois 60601  
7        (312) 814-3736  
8        Appearing for The People of the State of  
9        Illinois;

10       MR. ROBERT KELTER and  
11       MR. LARRY ROSEN  
12       208 South LaSalle Street  
13       Suite 1760  
14       Chicago, Illinois 60604  
15       (312) 263-4282  
16       Appearing for Citizens Utility Board;

17       MS. CARLA SCARSELLA and  
18       MS. LINDA BUELL (telephonically)  
19       160 North LaSalle Street  
20       Suite C-800  
21       Chicago, Illinois 60601  
22       (312) 793-3305  
23       Appearing for ICC Staff;

24       MR. JOHN ROONEY  
25       233 South Wacker Drive  
26       Suite 7800  
27       Chicago, Illinois 60606  
28       (312) 876-8925  
29       Appearing for Northern Illinois Gas Company  
30       d/b/a Nicor Gas;

31       MR. MICHAEL S. PABIAN  
32       10 South Dearborn Street  
33       Suite 3500  
34       Chicago, Illinois 60603  
35       (312) 394-5831  
36       Appearing for ComEd;

37

1 MS. GRETA WEATHERSBY  
130 East Randolph Street  
2 Chicago, Illinois 60601  
(312) 240-4474  
3 Appearing for The Peoples Gas Light & Coke  
Company and North Shore Gas Company;  
4  
5 MS. KAREN HUIZENGA  
106 East Seventh Street  
Davenport, Iowa 52801  
6 Appearing for MidAmerican Energy Company  
(telephonically);  
7  
8 MR. EDWARD FITZHENRY  
1901 Soto Avenue  
P.O. Box 66149  
9 Mail Code 1310  
St. Louis, Missouri 63166  
10 Appearing for Ameron Company  
(telephonically);  
11  
12 MR. ALAN CHERRY  
711 South River Road  
Suite 703  
13 Des Plaines, Illinois 60016  
Appearing for Community Action Utility Practice  
14 (telephonically).  
15  
16  
17  
18 SULLIVAN REPORTING COMPANY, by  
Julia C. White, CSR  
19  
20  
21  
22

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22

I N D E X

<u>Witnesses:</u>	<u>Direct</u>	<u>Cross</u>	<u>Re- direct</u>	<u>Re- cross</u>	<u>By Examiner</u>
None .					

E X H I B I T S

<u>Number</u>	<u>For Identification</u>	<u>In Evidence</u>
None .		

1           JUDGE SAINSOT: By the authority vested in me,  
2   I now call Docket 06-0379. It is the petition of the  
3   Citizens Utility Board and The People of the State of  
4   Illinois to Initiate a Rulemaking with Notice and  
5   Comment for Approval, and it concerns Part 280 of the  
6   Commission's rules.

7                   Will the parties identify themselves  
8   for the record, please.

9           MS. DALE: Janice Dale on behalf of The People  
10   of the State of Illinois, Office of the Illinois  
11   Attorney General, 100 West Randolph Street, Chicago,  
12   Illinois 60601.

13          MR. KELTER: On behalf of the Citizens Utility  
14   Board, Robert Kelter and Larry Rosen, 208 South  
15   LaSalle, Suite 1760, Chicago 60604.

16          MS. SCARSELLA: On behalf of the Staff  
17   witnesses of the Illinois Commerce Commission,  
18   Carla Scarsella and Linda Buell, 160 North LaSalle  
19   Street, Suite C-800, Chicago, Illinois 60601.

20          MR. ROONEY: On behalf of Northern Illinois Gas  
21   Company, d/b/a Nicor Gas, John Rooney, Sonnenschein  
22   Nath & Rosenthal, LLP, 233 South Wacker Drive,

1 Suite 7800, Chicago, Illinois 60606.

2 MR. PABIAN: On behalf of Commonwealth Edison  
3 Company, Michael S. Pabian, 10 South Dearborn Street,  
4 Chicago, Illinois 60603.

5 MS. WEATHERSBY: And on behalf of The Peoples  
6 Gas Light & Coke Company and North Shore Gas Company,  
7 Greta Weathersby, 130 East Randolph, Chicago,  
8 Illinois 60601.

9 JUDGE SAINSOT: Are there any appearances by  
10 phone?

11 MS. HUIZENGA: Karen Huizenga appearing for  
12 MidAmerican Energy Company, 106 East Seventh Street,  
13 Davenport, Iowa 52801.

14 MR. FITZHENRY: Edward Fitzhenry for the Ameron  
15 Company, 1901 Soto Avenue, Post Office Box 66149,  
16 Mail Code 1310, St. Louis, Missouri, 63166-6149.

17 MR. CHERRY: Alan Cherry appearing for Utility  
18 Advocacy Project (phonetic), 711 South River Road,  
19 No. 703, Des Plaines, Illinois 60016, appearing on  
20 behalf of Community Action Utility Practice  
21 (phonetic). I'm the movant in one of the 280 cases  
22 and participating in the other but is not intervened

1 yet.

2 JUDGE SAINSOT: Are there any further  
3 appearances?

4 Mr. Cherry, have you filed a petition  
5 for leave to intervene?

6 MR. CHERRY: No, I have not.

7 JUDGE SAINSOT: Okay. But you will be filing  
8 one?

9 MR. CHERRY: Yes.

10 JUDGE SAINSOT: Just so we're all clear, I  
11 called this emergency status because, technically,  
12 the Commission is supposed to act on any petition for  
13 a rulemaking within 30 days.

14 So I'm going to start off with  
15 petitions for leave to intervene. I have one -- a  
16 joint petition on behalf of the Peoples Gas Light &  
17 Coke Company and North Shore Gas Company. I have a  
18 petition on behalf of North- -- Northern Illinois Gas  
19 Company, one on behalf of MidAmerican Energy Company,  
20 one on behalf of Commonwealth Edison Company, one on  
21 behalf of Central -- and this is the last one --  
22 Central Illinois Light Company, d/b/a Ameron Soco

1 (phonetic) and, I believe, the Ameron Sips (phonetic)  
2 Companies.

3 Are there any objections to granting  
4 these petitions for leave to intervene?

5 Okay. Hearing none, they're all  
6 granted.

7 Okay. I also have a motion before me  
8 to consolidate this docket with two other dockets,  
9 which are Docket No. 05-0237 and Docket No. 06-0202.

10 I took a look at the motion, and the  
11 service list doesn't really indicate that the parties  
12 in the other dockets have been served with that  
13 motion. I also took a look at the e-Docket in those  
14 two other dockets, and the motion to consolidate was  
15 never filed in those two other dockets.

16 So on that basis, I am going to deny  
17 the motion to consolidate without prejudice. You can  
18 refile but, certainly, the notice and opportunity to  
19 be heard in the future should be complete.

20 And just so we're clear, normally,  
21 when you consolidate cases, the oldest case takes  
22 precedent. The oldest case, in this instance, is set



1     for trial in June. So there is an issue there that  
2     if there's a motion to consolidate, you're going to  
3     have to work around a big issue.

4                     Okay. That being said, has anybody  
5     talked about a discovery schedule in this docket?

6             MS. DALE: No, your Honor. We had discussed --  
7     Mr. Cherry and Mr. Rosen and I had discussed having a  
8     schedule that was similar to the one that was sent in  
9     0202 in which Staff needed to file their testimony on  
10    June 30th and all the testimony will be filed  
11    July 21st, and that's as far as that schedule has  
12    gone.

13            MR. ROONEY: Your Honor, on behalf of Nicor, in  
14    this instance, frankly, we haven't -- didn't think  
15    about scheduling it at this point given --

16            JUDGE SAINSOT: Right.

17            MR. ROONEY: -- we're on a standing motion to  
18    consolidate. And, second of all, we do have -- we  
19    would have some concern about consolidating the  
20    existing 06-0202 schedule with the -- with -- what's  
21    now being proposed in this proceeding. I guess my  
22    recommendation is if CUB/AG were to file their

1 motions to consolidate, we may want to first  
2 establish a schedule until we determine what's  
3 consolidated at this point.

4 And clearly, you know, from Nicor's  
5 standpoint, we would have substantial concerns about  
6 consolidation with 05-0237 particularly given two  
7 previous rulings that were made in that proceeding  
8 regarding denial of consolidation in 06-0202 as well  
9 as issues that were raised in the 05-0237.

10 So from Nicor's perspective, if the  
11 parties are intending to refile the motion to  
12 consolidate, it would be our proposal to determine a  
13 schedule until we establish what's -- what's going to  
14 be part of this docket.

15 JUDGE SAINSOT: I don't disagree with anything  
16 you've said, Mr. Rooney. But, technically, I think  
17 the rule says that I have to set a trial date and the  
18 discovery schedule. Certainly, those things can be  
19 modified. So I -- I understand where you're coming  
20 from. I'm -- I'm just bound by the rule, I think, in  
21 this case.

22 MR. ROONEY: I mean, clearly, from -- from

1 Nicor's perspective, we have no objection to the  
2 rulemaking going forward pursuant to, I think, the  
3 concerns that we have in the statute. So I don't  
4 think it's a question of -- at least certainly from  
5 Nicor's perspective objecting to the petition. It's  
6 more of a scheduling issue.

7 MR. KELTER: Well --

8 MS. DALE: Well, could I respond, your Honor?

9 In fact, I -- I had suggested that we  
10 adopt some schedule in 0202. That -- that's separate  
11 from the issue of whether or not anything is going to  
12 be consolidated. I'm just suggesting, as a start, we  
13 could -- we could agree to have a filing of testimony  
14 on those days during the discovery period.

15 The petition has been filed. The  
16 ruling has been filed. The other parties in the  
17 case -- the Utilities in the case are well-aware of  
18 the rule because we've been discussing it for the  
19 last year. So there's no reason that discovery  
20 couldn't begin immediately. We're not trying to  
21 delay any other case. I'm just suggesting, at the  
22 beginning of the schedule, that -- that we could at

1     least start with before the consolidation issue  
2     was -- was resolved.

3             MR. ROONEY:   And --

4             MS. DALE:   And it doesn't require  
5     consolidation.

6             MR. ROONEY:   And to that point, my observation  
7     is we would object to -- we would ask for a status  
8     for June 30th be a schedule that was established in  
9     06-0202 as premised upon the testimony that is not as  
10    expansive than what is being proposed in the rule  
11    changes filed by the AG, your Honor.   That's Nicor's  
12    petition.

13            MR. PABIAN:   Your Honor, ComEd would echo that;  
14    and Mr. Cherry filed his petition in March, and this  
15    petition was filed in May; and to adopt the same  
16    schedule, I think, would be -- we would have real  
17    concerns about that.

18            MS. SCARSELLA:   And, your Honor, if I may note,  
19    as far as I'm aware, the direct testimony has not  
20    been filed by CUB and AG in this proceeding.   So to  
21    even proceed with discovery, we would need to see  
22    some kind of testimony in support of their petition.

1 JUDGE SAINSOT: Usually it's done the other way  
2 around. First you see the -- first you get the  
3 discovery and then you get the testimony. But, I  
4 mean, whatever.

5 MR. CHERRY: This is the CUB's petition, but  
6 the testimony has been before the Utilities for  
7 probably just a month or two short of a year because  
8 it was filed -- the 05-0237 case --

9 MS. SAINSOT: Mr. Cherry, you're going to need  
10 to speak up a little bit.

11 MR. CHERRY: All right.

12 MS. SAINSOT: We've got -- we've got fire  
13 engines or something.

14 MR. CHERRY: Oh, okay. I'll try again.

15 The schedule that was set in 06-0202  
16 was also based, and would be in this case, with the  
17 fact that the testimony of CUB and the AG and the  
18 City was actually filed, I think, 10 or 11 months ago  
19 and has been in front of the Utilities for that long.

20 JUDGE SAINSOT: You're talking about that 05  
21 docket?

22 MR. CHERRY: Right. And maybe CUB could

1 explain, but I think it would be the same testimony.

2 MR. PABIAN: Your -- your Honor, in that -- in  
3 that docket, no where -- at no time in that docket  
4 did the parties address the merits of that testimony  
5 because there were -- the -- the efforts of the party  
6 in that docket were aimed at the procedural propriety  
7 of including the -- the issues raised by that  
8 testimony in that docket.

9 So it -- it really -- at no time in  
10 that docket were the parties focused on responding  
11 completely to the -- to the merits of that petition.

12 MR. KELTER: Well --

13 JUDGE SAINSOT: Well, let me ask you something:  
14 What's the schedule like in 06-0202? Does somebody  
15 have an opinion?

16 MR. ROONEY: I know at a minimum, your Honor,  
17 it anticipates the -- the filing of direct testimony  
18 by Staff and Intervenors on June 30th, I believe.

19 MR. CHERRY: A hearing on August 16th and 17th,  
20 as I recall. I don't know if we formally set those,  
21 but we were certainly looking at those dates, yes.

22 MS. SCARSELLA: And rebuttal testimony by the

1     petitioner in that docket is due the 21st of July.

2             MR. CHERRY:   Correct.

3             MR. KELTER:   Your Honor --

4             MR. CHERRY:   The formal -- on the record -- the  
5     last -- or off the record -- the hearing -- we  
6     discussed those dates that somebody just mentioned.

7             MR. KELTER:   Your Honor, can I just --

8             MR. CHERRY:   The August dates.

9             MR. KELTER:   Can I just raise an issue here.

10            JUDGE SAINSOT:  Sure.

11            MR. KELTER:   I mean, we do have a situation  
12     where we've got -- apparently we're going to have  
13     three different dockets, three different rulemakings  
14     all covering -- or at least with overlap, to some  
15     extent, of the same rules.

16                         So I think the schedule that -- that  
17     the AG has discussed this morning is at least trying  
18     to address that issue in some way.  I'm not sure  
19     what's going to happen in this case, but it seems  
20     like we're heading for a situation where we've got  
21     different judges and different hearings based on the  
22     same set of rules; and I don't see how that plays

1 out, logically.

2 MR. PABIAN: Your Honor, that goes to the  
3 merits of consolidation. I mean, if you're going to  
4 adopt the same schedule, you're assuming -- you're  
5 essentially assuming consolidation; and I think that  
6 prejudices it.

7 JUDGE SAINSOT: Well, not necessarily. If -- I  
8 mean, for example, a lot of times when we do cases  
9 with Peoples Gas and North Shore, we do the schedules  
10 together so that it's easier for Counsel, you know.

11 So if you adopt the same schedule, it  
12 doesn't necessarily mean that the cases are identical  
13 or the cases should be consolidated. It just may be  
14 easier for Counsel.

15 MR. KELTER: Sure.

16 MR. PABIAN: That's true, your Honor. But  
17 Mr. Kelter's arguments are essentially arguments for  
18 consolidation.

19 MR. KELTER: Well, what I did -- no. What -- I  
20 didn't say we should consolidate. What I'm doing is  
21 I'm raising an issue here that's the 1,000 pound  
22 elephant, or whatever you want to call it, that we've



1 got a problem; and it seems like the time to deal  
2 with it is now rather than at the end of the -- at  
3 the end of two proceedings where --

4 JUDGE SAINSOT: Well --

5 MR. KELTER: -- you've got this kind of  
6 overlap.

7 JUDGE SAINSOT: You know, I -- I don't know  
8 what to say to that. I've -- I will reiterate that I  
9 did not -- I denied the motion to consolidate without  
10 prejudice. But because I denied it, it's really not  
11 before me now anymore.

12 So I -- I agree with you that that's  
13 not -- it doesn't seem like a good situation, but  
14 I -- the notice and opportunity to be heard is the  
15 worse situation. So, temporarily, that's off the  
16 table.

17 Can you set a schedule that at least  
18 mirrors the 06-0202? Maybe not exactly, but if  
19 you're going to be down that road preparing testimony  
20 about Part 280, maybe it makes sense to get it done a  
21 little later than the 06-0202.

22 Does that make sense?

1           MR. KELTER: I think it makes sense because at  
2   least the idea would be worse case scenario that the  
3   Commission would have orders to deal with at a  
4   similar time so that they can consider rules in a way  
5   that where they're looking at one rule, there may be  
6   two different orders; but on that same rule, at least  
7   there's some way for the Commission to look at them  
8   in a way that makes sense.

9           MR. ROONEY: Two points, your Honor: First of  
10   all, the Commission has considered the issue. In  
11   05-0237, they've entered an interim order setting the  
12   scope of that document.

13          JUDGE SAINSOT: Uh-huh.

14          MR. ROONEY: They were fully cognizant of the  
15   testimony that was filed by South Austin and by the  
16   CUB/AG and the City in -- in 05-0237.

17                    The Commission entered an order that  
18   said, No, that's outside the scope of what the joint  
19   petitioners filed in that case. And so they said, Go  
20   forward with 05-0237, which is what we're doing. In  
21   terms of 06-0202 and -- and this current proceeding,  
22   I think the issue is there was an effort to

1     consolidate 06-0202 with 05-0237 within the past few  
2     weeks. That motion also was denied.

3                     So now what we're presented with --  
4     and -- and Nicor's opinion in this proceeding is that  
5     05-0237 is on track and can do its own thing and  
6     proceed under the schedule that's currently  
7     established.

8                     With regards to 06-0202 and this  
9     proceeding, Nicor doesn't have any objection if, in  
10    fact, the parties went back to proceed to  
11    consolidate. But if there's a consolidation, we're  
12    going to need more time in order to respond to the  
13    additional testimony. We agreed to a schedule with  
14    the parties of 06-0202 based on the testimony that  
15    was filed in that case.

16                    And I think Staff Counsel has noted,  
17    you know, while we have a petition, we're still -- we  
18    think that there's going to be an oppor- -- pardon  
19    me. Nicor is going to need more opportunity to  
20    present testimony that encompasses not only the  
21    06- -- whatever is being proposed in this proceeding.

22                    So I think the Commission has to --

1 has understood the issue, and they decided to go a  
2 different direction. And I can provide you with a  
3 copy of the interim order, if you'd like it; and I'll  
4 send a transcript available from the other hearing.

5 JUDGE SAINSOT: I -- I think it's perfectly  
6 reasonable to ask for more time. There's no deadline  
7 on a rulemaking. So there's nothing wrong with  
8 asking for more time.

9 So I'm going to leave you alone for a  
10 few minutes, and I'm sure you all can find something  
11 that you can live with; but I think the rule requires  
12 setting a trial date. It doesn't say a permanent  
13 trial date. It just says a trial date.

14 MR. ROONEY: Thanks, your Honor.

15 (Whereupon, a recess was taken.)

16 MS. DALE: All right. We've come up with a  
17 brief schedule, your Honor.

18 JUDGE SAINSOT: Okay.

19 MS. DALE: We would propose that we would serve  
20 our testimony in this case either today or tomorrow,  
21 and that --

22 JUDGE SAINSOT: CUB and AG?

1           MR. KELTER: We'll serve it tomorrow.

2           MS. DALE: Tomorrow, okay. So that will be

3   5/20. The Staff and Intervenors will have until --

4           MR. PABIAN: 5/19. Today's the --

5           MR. ROONEY: Yeah, tomorrow is 19.

6           MS. DALE: 19th? I'm sorry.

7                   And Intervenors and Staff would have

8   until the 19th of July to respond, and then we would

9   ask for four weeks on our rebuttal.

10          JUDGE SAINSOT: So you're talking about

11   August 19th, roughly?

12          MS. DALE: Uh-huh.

13          MR. ROONEY: August 16th.

14          JUDGE SAINSOT: August 16th?

15          MS. DALE: That's fine.

16          MR. ROONEY: And then we'd ask for, your Honor,

17   three weeks after that point before our hearing date

18   was scheduled.

19          JUDGE SAINSOT: So early September?

20          MR. ROONEY: Right, and anytime after

21   September 6th.

22          MR. PABIAN: Right. And, your Honor, this is

1 contingent on the parties agreeing to a 14-day  
2 turnaround on discovery requests -- or data requests  
3 as opposed to the --

4 JUDGE SAINSOT: Right. So a 14-day turnaround  
5 on all discovery except for prefiled testimony, which  
6 technically is discovery at this point.

7 MS. DALE: And then -- I'm sorry. John, did  
8 you -- you suggested that we wait three weeks before  
9 we set?

10 MR. ROONEY: No, I'm saying we can set a trial  
11 date now.

12 MS. DALE: Oh, okay.

13 MR. ROONEY: I'm just saying three weeks to the  
14 extent that we want to come back with discovery and  
15 rebuttal testimony.

16 MS. DALE: Okay.

17 MR. ROONEY: And I think -- so anytime after  
18 September 6th.

19 JUDGE SAINSOT: How about September 12th? Does  
20 that work? September 12th then?

21 MR. ROONEY: That's fine.

22 MR. KELTER: Two weeks for hearings?

1 JUDGE SAINSOT: Oh, how many days? Two weeks?

2 MR. PABIAN: Two weeks.

3 MS. DALE: A week.

4 JUDGE SAINSOT: A week.

5 MR. KELTER: A little -- little legal humor.

6 JUDGE SAINSOT: How long do you need for -- for

7 the actual trial?

8 MR. KELTER: Three days.

9 MS. DALE: Three days.

10 MR. ROONEY: I reserve three days.

11 MS. SCARSELLA: Yeah, three days.

12 MR. KELTER: As the case goes on, if the

13 parties feel that three days is too short, we can

14 come; and if we feel it's too long, we can just

15 finish early.

16 JUDGE SAINSOT: Well, I'll tell you, I -- if

17 this case doesn't get consolidated with Judge

18 Hilliard's case, I will probably be out of town that

19 Friday. So if it goes longer than three days, you're

20 just going to have to do it the next week.

21 MR. KELTER: That's fine.

22 MR. ROONEY: I'm certainly hoping it doesn't.

1           MR. KELTER:   Yeah.

2           JUDGE SAINSOT:   So the trial date will be

3   Tuesday, September 12th, Wednesday, September 13th

4   and Thursday, September 14th?

5           MS. DALE:   Right.

6           MR. ROONEY:   Right.

7           JUDGE SAINSOT:   Okay.

8           MR. KELTER:   The only thing I would suggest is

9   why don't we start at 9:00 or 9:30 on the -- on the

10   12th, unless there are --

11          MR. ROONEY:   Whatever the pleasure of the judge

12   is fine.

13          JUDGE SAINSOT:   9:30?

14          MR. KELTER:   It seems like -- it seems like the

15   first day it takes a while to get going.   So give

16   our- -- let's give ourselves sort of a full day that

17   first day.

18          JUDGE SAINSOT:   Okay.   So September 12th, we'll

19   start at 9:30.   You really should have a status date

20   before the --

21          MS. DALE:   Yes.

22          JUDGE SAINSOT:   -- trial.



1                   How about September 7th or -- let's do  
2   it a little before that.

3                   September 6th?

4           MR. ROONEY:   Sure.

5           MR. PABIAN:   Okay.

6           JUDGE SAINSOT:  At 11:00, status.

7                   At that time, any pretrial motions or  
8   anything like that will be filed two to three days  
9   ahead of time.

10          MR. KELTER:   Sorry, Judge.  You said 11:00?

11          MS. DALE:    Uh-huh.

12          JUDGE SAINSOT:  Right, 11:00.

13                 All right.  Is there anything else we  
14   need to discuss?

15          MS. DALE:    Just for the record, your Honor, I  
16   did speak to Counsel for parties here today; and it  
17   appears People weren't served.  I want to apologize  
18   on behalf of the AG that not everybody got served.  
19   It appears People did get served but not in the other  
20   -- in this docket but not in the other dockets so  
21   that they do have notice of the motion, but we will  
22   file it again properly.

1           JUDGE SAINSOT: Well, yeah. The parties to the  
2 other dockets need to know that -- what's going on,  
3 as well. It affects them just as much as it affects  
4 the People in this docket.

5           MS. DALE: And I apologize for that. We  
6 thought everyone had been served in all dockets.

7           JUDGE SAINSOT: Well, we'll just go forward.

8                   Okay. Anything further.

9           MR. PABIAN: No, your Honor.

10          JUDGE SAINSOT: Okay. Thanks.

11                               (Whereupon, the above-entitled  
12 matter was continued to  
13 September 6, 2006,  
14 at 11:00 a.m.)

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22